

REMARKS

Claims 1-3, 5, and 8-14 remain pending in this application for which applicant seeks reconsideration. Claims 1, 5, and 9-14 now stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Ramsay (USP 5,502,576) in view of Kuzma (USP 5,781,901) and Larky (USP 6,970,908). Claim 3 now stands rejected under § 103(a) as unpatentable over Ramsay in view of Kuzma, Larky, and Seder (USPGP 2002/0164053). Lastly, claims 2 and 8 now stand rejected under § 103(a) as unpatentable over Ramsay in view of Kuzma, Larky, and Cullen (USP 5,893,908).

In the last reply, applicant explained that none of the applied references would have disclosed or taught providing an operating section/unit that displays two buttons for determining whether the email notification should include the searched original document file. In response, the examiner now relies upon Larky for the proposition that providing a user interface, namely first and second buttons, to enable the user to selectively attach or not attach document to an email transmission would have been obvious.

Independent claims 1, 11, 12, and 14 call for setting, based on a user operation, (1) whether or not the **searched electronic document data files is to be attached** to an email notification and (2) whether or not **the email notification is automatically executed**. In rejecting the claims, the examiner merely addresses the feature (2) above and fails to address the feature (1) above with respect to Ramsay. Moreover, in addressing feature (2) above, the examiner mischaracterizes the automatic email notification feature as corresponding to a user issuing a retrieving command (“if the user decides not to issue a retrieve command, no notification is send by the server”). Applicant submits that the examiner’s interpretation of feature (2) is not tenable from the claimed language.

Indeed, the independent claims call for setting, based on a user operation, whether or not the electronic mail notification is automatically executed. These claims further call for displaying a result of a search, including a first button for transmitting the result of the search as an electronic mail notification with the searched original electronic document data file and a second button for transmitting the result of the search as an electronic mail notification without the searched original electronic document data file. The result of the search is transmitted as an electronic mail to an electronic mail address when the setting device sets the electronic mail notification is to be automatically executed or when one of the displayed first or second button is operated by a user. The examiner’s argument at best merely addresses manually using buttons

to transmit or not transmit the email notification. Ramsay and Larky fails to disclose or teach any provision for setting whether or not email notification is automatically executed.

Moreover, the setting feature (1) above calls for attaching the searched original electronic document data file to the electronic mail to be transmitted when the searched original electronic document data file is set to be attached, and not attaching the file corresponding to the searched original electronic document data file to the electronic mail to be transmitted when the searched original electronic document data file is set to be not attached.

Kuzma indeed provides the user with an option to send an attachment directly via an email or not send any attachment itself by an email, but rather send a reference or pointer that can be used by the user to separately retrieve the attachment. But Kuzma's attachment sending feature lacks nexus to obtaining any search result. Moreover, providing the user option to send or not send the attachment does not correspond to the claimed setting feature.

Applicant thus submits that the combination between Ramsay/Larky and Kuzma would not have taught the claimed setting feature. Similarly, applicant submits that Kuzma would not have taught the notifying feature, namely transmitting the result of the search as set forth in the claims.

Applicant submits that the pending claims patentably distinguish over the applied references and are in condition for allowance. Should the examiner have any issues concerning this reply or any other outstanding issues remaining in this application, applicant urges the examiner to contact the undersigned to expedite prosecution.

Respectfully submitted,

ROSSI, KIMMS & McDOWELL LLP

Lyle Kimms

LYLE KIMMS, REG. NO. 34,079

21 FEBRUARY 2009

DATE

20609 GORDON PARK SQUARE, SUITE 150
ASHBURN, VA 20147
703-726-6020 (PHONE)
703-726-6024 (FAX)